
**DCSS P3 PROJECT
TRAINING WORKGROUP
AUGUST 10, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Thursday, August 10, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Training Workgroup held its second official session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Doris Keller, State Co-Leader (DCSS Supervisor)
- ☒ Debra Paddack, County Co-Leader (Analyst---Sonoma)
- ☐ Ann Love, State Analyst (DCSS Analyst)
- ☒ Pamela Korman, County Analyst (Manager---San Bernadino)
- ☒ Sharon Quinn, Small County Rep (Senior DDA---Placer)
- ☒ Mary Leibham, Medium County Rep (Manager---Stanislaus)
- ☒ James Martinez, Large County Rep (FSO Supervisor---Fresno)
- ☒ Nora O'Brien, Advocate (Director, ACES)
- ☒ Gloria Clemons-White, DCSS, Training Unit
- ☒ Pat Pianko, Resource (OCSE Rep---Region 9)
- ☒ Michael Wright, Judicial Council Rep (Senior Attorney---AOC)
- ☐ Louise Bayles-Fightmaster, Judicial Council (Sonoma County Specialist)
- ☐ Stan Dettner, FTB Rep (CCSAS Child Support Specialist)
- ☒ Peter Dosh, FTB Rep (Supervisor ---Child Support Collections Program)

Attending *ex officio* were:

- ☒ Julie Hopkins, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Kathie Lalonde, Facilitator (SRA International)
- ☐ Nancy Bienia, Resource (OCSE Rep---DC)

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, and decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Julie Hopkins at julie.hopkins@dss.ca.gov.

B. REVIEW OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES

Julie Hopkins opened the meeting with a review of action items from the last meeting.

- Pat Pianko provided handouts of federal training materials
- Mary Liebham provided CDAA and CFSC materials, instructor roster and 2000/2001 Strategic Training Plan document to Doris and Debra
- Michael Wright provided Family Law Facilitator training materials to Doris and

Debra

- Doris Keller provided handouts of state training materials and results of 1410 survey
- Sharon Quinn provided a draft survey
- Pete Dosh provided FTB training materials to Doris and Debra
- Nora O'Brien was unable to provide ACES training material because they are internal Documents and could not be given out

Julie Hopkins listed a number of training needs identified by other groups:

- Bankruptcy
- Forms
- Jargon/Acronyms
- Customer Service

The group discussed these items, and felt that these needs will be addressed in the training that the group is proposing.

Julie Hopkins advised the group that all surveys would have to be approved by the P3 Leadership Team prior to sending them out.

C. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

- Complete stakeholder needs assessment
- Determine Training Type definitions
- Research and Information Reporting
- Develop constituency survey
- Develop recommendations for full future survey and needs assessment

Doris and Debra proposed that the group complete the training matrices for the five stakeholder groups. They proposed beginning with Priority One stakeholders, as they were absolutely necessary for the program to operate successfully. If there is sufficient time, the group will move on to the other stakeholders. Everyone agreed.

D. STAKEHOLDER NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The group discussed in detail the training needs of each stakeholder identified as Priority 1 and completed the matrix. A completed matrix is attached.

The training needs were identified as Mandatory, County Option (based on structure not on personal preference), or State Option (based on structure not on personal preference). The group decided that state option was needed because some of the state staff will need specific training and others would not. There was considerable discussion on county option. Some in the group thought it important that complete uniformity be required. Because of the large diversity in county size and practices, the group finally concluded that some stakeholders would be responsible for different functions depending on the county and therefore would

need different training. Staff with a variety of responsibilities may attend sessions that would not be mandatory under their state or county designated job title.

Stakeholder-Support Staff was defined as computer staff and file pullers.

E. DEFINITION OF TRAINING TYPES

As the group moved through the Priority One Matrix, we began providing definitions for the various types of training on the matrix. The following training types were defined:

- Customer Service-dealing with external customers
- Intake-accepting referrals/applications and setting up files
- Financial-payroll, budget, and claims
- Legal/Courts-what happens in court and the processes
- Case Management-caseload organizations, resources, case processing (phones calls, tickles, mail)
- IV-A/IV-E- how it works, interfaces and relates to child support
- Staff Development-learning skills to develop staff
- Complaint Resolution-Identify problems and take care of them
- Reports-Claims, CS157, CS800 series
- Community Resources-places to refer clients to
- Administrative/Managerial-how to be a manager

The group discussed how to proceed, and decided to wait on determining the detail training needs of Priority Stakeholders 2 through 5.

F. CONSTITUENCY SURVEY

The group started a discussion on the draft questionnaire that Sharon Quinn had prepared. The discussion included:

- Is the information in the 1410 survey sufficient for now?
- Is there time to send out a survey and get the information returned and analyzed?
- What is the goal of the survey? To see what training is wanted by the counties.
- What is the best method to get training out to the counties?
 - Regional
 - In person
 - Tapes, CD's, etc
 - Can the counties send staff to training outside the county

The group decided to table distribution of any survey instrument at this time. They concluded that there was sufficient information and expertise among the group members to move forward within the short time available. The questionnaire that Sharon developed would serve as an excellent base for the future full survey and needs assessment.

G. FUTURE FULL SURVEY AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The group discussed development of a Statewide Survey and Needs Assessment. They felt that in the short time remaining, it would be extremely difficult to develop such a survey. We decided to recommend issues that should be covered in a full survey and needs assessment. Following are the results of our brainstorming session on this question.

- Availability of training facilities
 - Size
 - Technical equipment
 - Available for State training use
- Internet access
- Feasibility of distance learning
- Involvement/use of local college or training institutions
- CBTs, videos
- Responsibility for training development and delivery
- Contract issues
- Frequency of training
- Level of training
- New staff training
- Availability of training staff within the county
- Number of trainers-education/certifications levels
- Equipment analysis-computers, etc
- Travel for training-trainers budget, travel allocation
- Room/equipment availability
- Capacity/sharing facilities
- Budget questions - training budget/per employee and travel allowances
- What courses have been developed?
- Coordinating new staff training
- Has training program been evaluated?
- Best practices; lessons learned
- "after the fact" evaluations - 1-2 months
- Is training modified based on evaluations?
- Local needs assessment/results
- What training needs aren't met at local level
- Incorporate our matrix
 - Developed
 - Contracted
 - Needed from state
- Willing/able to co-train (with another county)? With whom?
- Software training - contracted or in-house?
- With whom do they contract?
- Are training materials maintained on-line?
 - Will they share with DCSS?

- QC of training materials?
- Verification of accuracy
- Tracing training records - who receives what courses database
- Training required prior to promotions?
- Developed training strategies for staff
- How often is new staff training needed
- Formal needs assessment?
- Who is using CBTs, videos, or other training materials, classification of staff
- Distance limitation for employee travel/ overnights permitted?
- Allow for open comments, suggestions
- Provide all matrices for them to prioritize
- Types of staff development training
 - Current
 - Desired

Doris will develop a draft recommendation for the future full survey and needs assessment. The group will review and discuss this recommendation in the next session.

H. CROSS-WORKGROUP ISSUES

James and Mary are still working on the cross-over items

I. SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS

No system requirements were identified

J. HANDOUTS

- Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement Training Resources
- Certifying Child Support Case Workers-Maryland (condensed version)
- Certification for Child Support Enforcement Workers-Maryland
- NCSEA State by State Survey: Personnel Practices Related to Child Support Caseworkers
- Training available at the State Level
- UC Davis Training
- Certificate Program in CalWORKs Case Management
- 1410 Survey Results related to Staff Development and Training Programs
- Draft Training Questionnaire
- Child Support Enforcement Grant Activities: Skills Standards and Curriculum Design
- Matrix of Internet and Word Processors available in the counties
- Staff Development/Training Programs in County Family Support Offices (Compiled from SB 1410 Surveys), August 2000
- Training Matrices: Priority One through Five Stakeholders

K. ACTION ITEMS/HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT SESSION

- See attached listing

J. ANCILLARY (PARKING LOT) ISSUES

- None

K. ATTACHMENTS

- Action Item List
- Completed Priority One Training Matrix

L. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR SESSION THREE

- Complete recommendations for future full survey and needs assessment to be performed by the State.
- Brainstorm recommendations for the structure and mission of the State's future training program. Discussion topics will include:
 - An FSS certification program
 - A uniform statewide orientation class
 - Possible certification class for support commissioners and/or family law facilitators
 - A terms glossary
 - Compiling a training resource directory
- Discuss recommendation format; plan next workgroup session